

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT-DISTRICT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE  
[via transfer designation to UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT- DISTRICT OF MAINE]  
CIVIL ACTION NO: 1:24-cv-00360  
ANDRE BISASOR, et. al. v. NEW HAMPSHIRE JUDICIAL BRANCH, et. al

**PLAINTIFFS' FURTHER [EMERGENCY] MOTION TO EXTEND THE TIME TO FILE A  
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF OR AN OBJECTION TO THE MAGISTRATE  
JUDGE'S 4-8-25 REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

1. Plaintiffs respectfully move the Court for an extension of time to file an objection to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation dated April 8, 2025; and which deadline was extended to 5-22-25 pursuant to a motion to extend time, filed on April 17, 2025.<sup>1</sup>
2. NB: This is filed as an emergency because the deadline expires on 5-22-25, which is today, and the plaintiffs had expected a ruling by today on the pending motion to clarify, but evidently none was forthcoming today.
3. Plaintiffs file this request in light of ongoing procedural uncertainty and the Court's lack of response to Plaintiff's previously filed motion to clarify, which was submitted on May 14, 2025. In that motion to clarify, Plaintiff specifically requested, as part of the relief sought, an extension of time to file an objection to the Report and Recommendation or, in the alternative, to file a motion for reconsideration and to amend the complaint. However, as of the date of this filing, the Court has not yet acted on the motion to clarify or addressed the within request for an extension.
4. Therefore, Plaintiffs now separately and formally submit this motion, in an abundance of caution, as a follow-up to the within request made in the motion to clarify, in order to preserve their rights and to avoid any risk of procedural default, given that the deadline for filing objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation is today.
5. Plaintiffs believe that an extension is warranted and appropriate under these circumstances, particularly because the issues raised in the motion to clarify are directly relevant to the scope, timing, and nature of any objection or motion for reconsideration or amended complaint that might be filed.

---

<sup>1</sup> Note: In that 4-17-25 motion, the plaintiffs requested "*an extension of the current deadline to file an objection to the report and recommendation of 30 days until May 22, 2025. This includes time to prepare and file a motion for clarification, then to hear back from the court on that, and then to prepare and file a motion for reconsideration, prior to preparing and filing an objection with an amended complaint.*" On 4-18-25, the court issued an order stating that the motion was granted. Therefore, it was understood that the plaintiffs would be subsequently filing a motion to clarify, which they did on 5-14-25.

6. The Report and Recommendation recommends dismissal of the entire action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction unless Plaintiffs file an amended complaint that states a claim within the Court's jurisdiction.
7. However, the Report and Recommendation does not specify what amendments are required, nor does it address several claims and defendants that are distinct from the state court judgments at issue<sup>2</sup>, among other things as stated in the motion to clarify.
8. Plaintiff's motion to clarify was filed precisely to seek guidance on these points. But the Court has not yet provided any clarification or guidance on these critical issues, and as a result, Plaintiff is unable to determine how to proceed with an objection or amendment in a manner consistent with the Court's expectations and the requirements of due process.
9. Plaintiffs reasonably presume that the Court will grant an extension of time to file an objection once it is able to provide a ruling on the motion to clarify, particularly since the Court itself appears to need further time to consider and rule on the pending motion to clarify. Nevertheless, because the Court has not yet issued any order extending the objection deadline, Plaintiffs must formally request such an extension to ensure that their rights are fully protected.
10. Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court extend the deadline for filing an objection to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, as well as any related motion for reconsideration or amendment to the complaint, until a reasonable period after the Court issues a ruling on the pending motion to clarify.
11. The plaintiffs think at least 45 to 60 days from the date of the court's order on the motion to clarify seems reasonable at this juncture<sup>3</sup>, especially since it appears that the court requires further time to review and issue a ruling on the motion to clarify, but the plaintiffs will leave it to the Court to determine the appropriate

---

<sup>2</sup> It should be noted also that at the time of the filing of the complaint in October 2024, there was not any final state court judgment in state court, as the matter was still under review in state court without any final state court judgment entered, and thus the complaint, as of when it was filed, could not have been seeking to overturn any state court judgment. This court should not anachronistically use outside events that may occur later or subsequent to the complaint, against the complaint, when those facts or events were not pled in the complaint. The court should treat the complaint, as of the time it was filed, to determine jurisdiction. Conversely, either way, the plaintiffs have, in the motion to clarify, pointed out that the even subsequent events still do not render any state court judgment final.

<sup>3</sup> It appears that when the plaintiffs requested 30 days extension on 4-17-25, that was not adequate enough time as time has ran out now. The plaintiffs do not want to make the same mistake of requesting too short of a time, so the plaintiffs asks the court to use its judgment to give a reasonable amount of time in light of everything including the length and complexity of the original complaint, and the length and complexity of the court's order on the motion to clarify in conjunction with the R&R.

time for extension, in light of the length and/or complexity of the order on the motion to clarify, and the attendant time it will take to review that order and the R&R, in the context of the 78 page complaint, and to also prepare an amended complaint, and an objection or a motion for reconsideration. Plaintiffs trust that they are making sense, however in-artfully so.

12. [Note: As a concomitant that should go without saying, Plaintiffs further request that the Court not take any adverse action based on the expiration of the current objection deadline while the motion to clarify remains pending and in light of the pending request to extend the deadline prior to expiration of the deadline.]
13. Granting this extension will serve the interests of justice, avoid prejudice to Plaintiffs, and ensure that the Court's review of the Report and Recommendation is fully informed by a clear and complete record.
14. Plaintiffs have acted diligently and in good faith at every stage of these proceedings thus far, and seeks only to preserve their rights and to comply with the Court's orders and procedural rules.
15. We respectfully submit that there is good cause for granting this extension, as noted above.
16. Furthermore, as pro se litigants, it's our understanding that we are entitled to some degree of leniency in procedural matters. The Supreme Court has held that pro se pleadings should be held to "less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers" (*Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972)). Granting this extension would be consistent with that principle and would ensure that we have a fair opportunity to present our case.
17. For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiffs respectfully requests that the Court grant an extension of time to file an objection to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, as well as any related motion for reconsideration or amendment of the complaint, until after the Court has ruled on the pending motion to clarify, and for such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,  
/s/ Andre Bisasor  
Andre Bisasor, Pro Se

/s/ Natalie Anderson  
Natalie Anderson, Pro Se

Dated: May 22, 2025